



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/849,746	09/05/1997	URS LOHER	LUDE14.313	4225
3624	7590	03/17/2004	EXAMINER	
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C. UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			STAICOVICI, STEFAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/849,746

Applicant(s)

LOHER ET AL.

Examiner

Stefan Staicovici

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' amendment filed December 18, 2003 has been entered. Claims 1-2, 15 and 27 have been amended. Claims 17-26 have been canceled. Claims 28-31 have been added. Claims 1-16 and 27-31 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 7, 11, 13-14 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,662,887).

EP 0 373 294 teaches the basic claimed process of forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic component including, preparing a rod blank (6) from a fiber reinforced thermoplastic material having a plurality of fibers (2) embedded within a PEEK thermoplastic matrix, positioning said blank in a mold, heating said entire blank inside said mold at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material and compressing said blank inside said mold to form said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component.

Since the thermoplastic material is heated above the softening (melting) temperature, it is submitted that the thermoplastic material flows inside the mold to take the shape of the mold surface (shaping the blank in the negative mold by virtue of the entire blank flowing from the heating stage into the negative mold) (see Abstract and Figure 6).

Regarding claim 1, EP 0 373 294 does not teach heating the blank outside the mold. Ackley ('723) teaches a molding process of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank including, preheating said blank to a soft, flowable state in an infrared oven outside the mold, placing said heated blank in a mold and molding said blank under pressure such that said thermoplastic material flows and fills said mold (see col. 6, lines 1-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have preheated the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank to a soft, flowable state outside the mold as taught by Ackley ('723) in the process of EP 0 373 294 because, Ackley ('723) specifically teaches that preheating outside the mold reduces molding time, hence improving productivity and lowering costs (see col. 5, lines 45-50).

Further regarding claim 1, it is noted that EP 0 373 294 teaches molding of a PEEK/carbon fiber composite screw. However, whether said screws are used for aerospace or medical applications is a functional limitation. In a claim drawn to a process, recitation of the intended "medical" use of the claimed "screws" step must result in a structural difference between the claimed process and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As such, in a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. However, in order to advance prosecution of the instant application, the teachings of Turner *et al.* ('887) are provided

to show that it is well known to make medical components from a PEEK/carbon fiber composite (see Abstract and col. 6, lines 55-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a PEEK/carbon fiber composite as taught by Turner *et al.* ('887) to make a medical screw using the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) because, Turner *et al.* ('887) specifically teaches that a PEEK/carbon fiber composite may be used to make medical devices, whereas EP 0 373 294 teaches molding of screws made from a PEEK/carbon fiber composite. Furthermore, it is noted that if the prior art structure, as taught by Turner *et al.* ('887) is capable of performing the intended use of a medical screw, as claimed, then it meets the claim.

In regard to claim 2, EP 0 373 294 teaches continuous (endless) fibers in a proportion of 60-70% by weight. It is submitted that a fiber proportion of 70% by weight is more than 50% by volume (see col. 8, lines 10-20).

Specifically regarding claim 3, EP 0 373 294 teaches forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic rod and cutting said rod to form a blank (see col. 8, lines 10-30).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, EP 0 373 294 teaches continuous (endless) fibers (Elongated fibers) (2) arranged in a parallel direction (col. 8, lines 15-20).

In regard to claim 7, EP 0 373 294 teaches axially compressing (pushing) a heated pre-finished blank to obtain said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component and pulling said formed component.

Specifically regarding claim 13, it should be noted that EP 0 373 294 teaches the use of "continuous" fibers having the same length as the resulting molded article. It is submitted that

the resulting screw (fasteners) of EP 0 373 294 is longer than 3 mm. Therefore, the fibers used in the process of EP 0 373 294 are also longer than 3 mm.

Regarding claim 14, EP 0 373 294 teaches that the fibers are enclosed by the thermoplastic resin (see Figure 7).

In regard to claims 28-31, EP 0 373 294 teaches a rod-shaped, circular blank (see Figure 6).

4. Claims 1-5, 7, 11-14 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackely (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* (US Patent No. 45,156,588).

JP 02-145327 teaches the basic claimed process for manufacturing fiber reinforced thermoplastic components including, forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic tubular blank (13), cutting said fiber reinforced thermoplastic tubular blank to form a pre-finished blank (16), positioning said pre-finished blank (16) in a mold (18) (negative mold), heating said pre-finished blank (16) at a given temperature in said mold (18) (heating the entire blank to a forming temperature in a heating stage) and axially compressing said heated pre-finished blank in said mold (18) to obtain said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component (22). Further, JP 02-145327 teaches that the fibers are enclosed by the thermoplastic resin (see Figures 4-6). Therefore, it is submitted that shaping of the pre-finished blank (16) in mold (18) by heating and axial compression occurs by flowing of the heated thermoplastic material of the pre-finished blank during the axial compression stage (shaping the blank in the negative mold by virtue of the entire blank flowing from the heating stage into the negative mold).

Regarding claim 1, JP 02-145327 does not teach heating the blank outside the mold. Ackley ('723) teaches a molding process of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank including, preheating said blank to a soft, flowable state in an infrared oven outside the mold, placing said heated blank in a mold and molding said blank under pressure such that said thermoplastic material flows and fills said mold (see col. 6, lines 1-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have preheated the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank to a soft, flowable state outside the mold as taught by Ackley ('723) in the process of JP 02-145327 because, Ackley ('723) specifically teaches that preheating outside the mold reduces molding time, hence improving productivity and lowering costs (see col. 5, lines 45-50).

Further regarding claim 1, it is noted that JP 02-145327 teaches molding of a nylon/glass fiber composite screw. However, whether said screws are used for aerospace or medical applications is a functional limitation. In a claim drawn to a process, recitation of the intended "medical" use of the claimed "screws" step must result in a structural difference between the claimed process and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. As such, in a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. However, in order to advance prosecution of the instant application, the teachings of Marcune *et al.* ('588) are provided to show that it is well known to make medical components from a nylon/glass fiber composite (see col. 4, lines 30-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a nylon/glass fiber composite as taught by Turner *et al.* ('887) to make a medical screw using the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) because, Marcune *et al.* ('588) specifically

teaches that a nylon/glass fiber composite may be used to make medical devices, whereas JP 02-145327 teaches molding of screws made from a nylon/glass fiber composite. Furthermore, it is noted that if the prior art structure, as taught by Marcune *et al.* ('588) is capable of performing the intended use of a medical screw, as claimed, then it meets the claim.

In regard to claim 2, JP 02-145327 teaches continuous (endless) fibers in a proportion of 70% by weight. It is submitted that a fiber proportion of 70% by weight is more than 50% by volume.

Specifically regarding claim 3, JP 02-145327 teaches forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic tubular blank (13) and cutting said fiber reinforced thermoplastic tubular blank to form a pre-finished blank (16) prior to heating and axially compressing said heated pre-finished blank in said mold (18) to obtain said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component (22) (hot-forming process).

Regarding claim 4, JP 02-145327 teaches continuous (endless) fibers that are knitted as a braided string (13) and as such correspond to at least a length of the blank.

In regard to claims 5 and 12, JP 02-145327 teaches continuous (endless) fibers that are knitted as a braided string (13) and as such form layers of different fiber orientation along the axial axis, said orientation being between 0°-90° (see Fig. 1B).

Specifically regarding claim 7, JP 02-145327 teaches axially compressing (pushing) a heated pre-finished blank (16) in a mold (18) by using a punch (20) to obtain said fiber reinforced thermoplastic component (22) and pulling said formed component.

Regarding claim 11, JP 02-145327 teaches continuous (endless) fibers that are parallel to the axis of the blank (see Figures 4-6).

Specifically regarding claim 13, it should be noted that JP 02-145327 teaches the use of "continuous" fibers having the same length as the resulting molded article. It is submitted that the resulting screw (fasteners) of EP 0 373 294 is longer than 3 mm. Therefore, the fibers used in the process of JP 02-145327 are also longer than 3 mm.

In regard to claim 14, JP 02-145327 teaches that the fibers are enclosed by the thermoplastic resin (see Figures 4-6).

Specifically regarding claims 28-31, JP 02-145327 teaches a rod-shaped, circular blank (see Figure 2).

5. Claims 5-6, 12 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,662,887) and Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906).

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claims 5-6 and 12, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) do not teach a laminated blank having fibers oriented in different directions. Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach a process of manufacturing fiber reinforced thermoplastic components including, forming panels (36) from fiber reinforced thermoplastic material (PEEK), cutting a section (40) from the panel and machining said section (40) to form a machined blank (52) having a head end (54), a shank portion (56) and a tail end (58) (pre-

finished blank) (see Figures 1, 4a, 4b). Further, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach that the panel from which the blanks are cut are formed from a plurality of layers (more than one laminate) having fibers oriented in different directions (see page 7, lines 1-10), such as to form a "0/+45/-45/90" layup. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have formed a laminated fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank having fibers oriented in different directions as taught by Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) for molding a fiber reinforced thermoplastic component by the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887), as an alternative to using an extruded or drawn fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank, due to a variety of advantages that a laminated blank provides such as simplicity, cost considerations, simpler equipment requirements, increased process versatility and also because both references teach heating and axial compression of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank, regardless of the method by which said blank is obtained. Further, it should be noted that both references teach similar materials, processes and end-products.

Specifically regarding claim 15, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach controlling the temperature of the die as a process control parameter to adjust the orientation of the fibers. Although, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) do not specifically teach the pressing speed as a process variable, it should be noted that the pressing speed is a conventional result-effective variable that is routinely adjusted for the purpose of positioning and aligning fibers based on the type of resin and fiber employed. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used routine optimization in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view

of Turner *et al.* ('887) and in further view of Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) to determine an optimum pressing speed, due to a variety of unclaimed parameters such as the type of resin employed, the type of fibers employed, equipment availability, etc.

6. Claims 6, 8 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,515,588) and Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906).

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) teaches the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 6, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) does not teach a laminated blank. Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach a process of manufacturing fiber reinforced thermoplastic components including, forming panels (36) from fiber reinforced thermoplastic material (PEEK), cutting a section (40) from the panel and machining said section (40) to form a machined blank (52) having a head end (54), a shank portion (56) and a tail end (58) (pre-finished blank) (see Figures 1, 4a, 4b). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have formed a laminated fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank as taught by Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) for molding a fiber reinforced thermoplastic component by the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588), as an alternative to using a braided fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank, due to a variety of advantages that a laminated blank provides such as simplicity, cost considerations, simpler equipment requirements, increased process versatility and also because

both references teach heating and axial compression of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank, regardless of the method by which said blank is obtained. Further, it should be noted that both references teach similar materials, processes and end-products.

In regard to claim 8, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach heating the blank to a temperature of 725 °F (385 °C) and then under pressure, cooling the shaped blank until a temperature of 400 °F (204 °C). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have heated the blank at a temperature from about 350 °C to 430 °C as taught by Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) because, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) specifically teach such a molding temperature and JP 02-145327 implies heating the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material.

Specifically regarding claim 15, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) teach controlling the temperature of the die as a process control parameter to adjust the orientation of the fibers. Although, Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) do not specifically teach the pressing speed as a process variable, it should be noted that the pressing speed is a conventional result-effective variable that is routinely adjusted for the purpose of positioning and aligning fibers based on the type of resin and fiber employed. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used routine optimization in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) and in further view of Gapp *et al.* (WO 91/02906) to determine an

optimum pressing speed, due to a variety of unclaimed parameters such as the type of resin employed, the type of fibers employed, equipment availability, etc.

7. Claims 8 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* (US Patent No. 45,156,588) and Gotoh *et al.* (US Patent No. 5,223,526).

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) teaches the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 10, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) does not teach a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material. Further, Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach PAEK as a replacement for nylon (see col. 1, lines 44-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588), because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach PAEK as a replacement for nylon in case of high temperature applications, hence enhancing product quality. Further, it should be noted that the particular use of a certain material is dependent on a variety of unclaimed parameters such as availability, cost considerations, desired characteristics, weight requirements, etc.

In regard to claims 8, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) do not teach a forming temperature of 350-450°C. However, Ackley ('723) teaches heating a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature such that it is soft and

flowable (see col. 6, lines 4-5). Further, it should be noted that because JP 02-145327 teaches that the fibers are enclosed by the thermoplastic resin (see Figures 4-6), it is submitted that shaping of the pre-finished blank in the mold by heating and axial compression occurs by flowing of the heated thermoplastic material of the pre-finished blank during the axial compression stage. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach that the molding temperature of PAEK is from about 350 °C to 430 °C (see col. 2, lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have heated the blank at a temperature from about 350 °C to 430 °C as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach such a molding temperature is required for a PAEK material and also because Ackley ('723) specifically teaches heating of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material.

8. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,662,887) and Gotoh *et al.* (US Patent No. 5,223,526).

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 10, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) do not teach a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material. Further, Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach PAEK as an equivalent replacement for PEEK (see col. 2, lines 52-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of

ordinary skill in the art to have used a carbon fiber reinforced PAEK material as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887), because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach PAEK as an equivalent replacement for PEEK. Further, it should be noted that the particular use of a certain material is dependent on a variety of unclaimed parameters such as availability, cost considerations, desired characteristics, weight requirements, etc.

In regard to claims 8, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) do not teach a forming temperature of 350-450 °C. Ackley ('723) teaches heating a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature such that it is soft and flowable (see col. 6, lines 4-5). EP 0 373 294 teaches heating a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank in a mold at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material in order to soften the material (flowing state) such that the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank assumes the shape of the mold. Gotoh *et al.* ('556) teach that the molding temperature of PAEK is from about 350 °C to 430 °C (see col. 2, lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have heated the blank at a temperature from about 350 °C to 430 °C as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach such a molding temperature is required for a PAEK material and also because Ackley ('723) specifically teaches heating of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have heated the blank at a temperature from about

350 °C to 430 °C as taught by Gotoh *et al.* ('556) in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) because Gotoh *et al.* ('556) specifically teach that such a molding temperature and EP 0 373 294 teaches heating the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank at a temperature above the softening (melting) temperature of the thermoplastic material.

9. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,662,887) and DE 37 39 582 A1.

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 16, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) do not teach applying a surface seal. DE 37 39 582 A1 teach a process of coating a molten plastic material by applying a carbon coating to a mold surface, injecting a molten plastic material inside the mold, and depositing said coating onto said melt as the carbon coating comes into contact with the molten polymer. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a carbon coating on the mold surface as taught by DE 37 39 582 A1 in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) due to a variety of advantages that such a coating process provides such as, reduced pollution, improved productivity, etc. and also because a carbon coated fastener provides for improved electrical characteristics.

10. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* (US Patent No. 45,156,588) and DE 37 39 582 A1.

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) teaches the basic claimed process as shown above.

Regarding claim 16, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) does not teach applying a surface seal. DE 37 39 582 A1 teach a process of coating a molten plastic material by applying a carbon coating to a mold surface, injecting a molten plastic material inside the mold, and depositing said coating onto said melt as the carbon coating comes into contact with the molten polymer. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a carbon coating on the mold surface as taught by DE 37 39 582 A1 in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) due to a variety of advantages that such a coating process provides such as, reduced pollution, improved productivity, etc. and also because a carbon coated fastener provides for improved electrical characteristics.

11. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,662,887) and Lee (US Patent No. 5,244,747).

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) teach the basic claimed process.

Regarding claim 9, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) do not teach the use of carbon or graphite as a release agent. Lee ('747) teaches that a carbon-based release agent is equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material (see col. 2, lines 35-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a carbon-based release agent as an equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent as taught by Lee ('747) in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) because, Lee ('747) specifically teaches that a carbon-based release agent is equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material, whereas EP 0 373 294 or JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teach molding of thermoplastic materials.

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,515,588) and Lee (US Patent No. 5,244,747).

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) teach the basic claimed process.

Regarding claim 9, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) do not teach the use of carbon or graphite as a release agent. Lee ('747) teaches that a carbon-based release agent is equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material (see col. 2, lines 35-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a carbon-based release agent as an equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent as taught by Lee ('747) in the process of JP 02-

145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) because, Lee ('747) specifically teaches that a carbon-based release agent is equivalent to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material, whereas EP 0 373 294 or JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) teach molding of thermoplastic materials.

13. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,662,887) and JP 01-258918.

EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) teach the basic claimed process.

Regarding claim 27, EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) do not teach a multiple reciprocating system. JP 01-258918 teaches molding a round fiber reinforced thermoplastic bar at both ends by a multiple push-pull process (see Abstract and Figure 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a multiple push-pull process as taught by JP 01-258918 in the process of EP 0 373 294 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Turner *et al.* ('887) because, JP 01-258918 teaches molding both ends of the bar having similar properties, hence improving productivity.

14. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley (US Patent No. 3,850,723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,515,588) and JP 01-258918.

JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) teaches the basic claimed process.

Regarding claim 27, JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) do not teach a multiple reciprocating system. JP 01-258918 teaches molding a round fiber reinforced thermoplastic bar at both ends by a multiple push-pull process (see Abstract and Figure 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a multiple push-pull process as taught by JP 01-258918 in the process of JP 02-145327 in view of Ackley ('723) and in further view of Marcune *et al.* ('588) because, JP 01-258918 teaches molding both ends of the bar having similar properties, hence improving productivity.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicants' remarks filed December 18, 2003 (Paper No. 29) have been considered.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references (see pages 10-11 of the amendment filed December 18, 2003), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In*

re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, EP 0 373 294 teaches the basic claimed process of forming a fiber reinforced thermoplastic screw component. However, EP 0 373 294 does not teach heating the blank outside the forming mold. Ackley ('723) teaches a molding process of a fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank including, preheating said blank to a soft, flowable state in an infrared oven outside the forming mold, placing said heated blank in a forming mold and molding said blank under pressure such that said thermoplastic material flows and fills said mold (see col. 6, lines 1-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have preheated the fiber reinforced thermoplastic blank to a soft, flowable state outside the mold as taught by Ackley ('723) in the process of EP 0 373 294 because, Ackley ('723) specifically teaches that preheating outside the mold reduces molding time, hence improving productivity and lowering costs (see col. 5, lines 45-50). Further, it is noted that under MPEP §2141.02, the "prior art reference must be considered *in its entirety*, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention" (emphasis added). W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).

Applicants argue that "Ackley does not discuss heating the blank to a soft flowable consistency" (see page 11 of the amendment filed December 18, 2003). However, in col. 6, lines 1-21, Ackley ('723) specifically teaches "heating the blank to a temperature at which the thermoplastic resin is in a soft or *flowable* state" (emphasis added).

Applicants argue that “70% by weight “ is not more than “50% by volume.’ However, it is a basic engineering principle that a weight average and a volume average are about 10-15% apart.

Applicants argue that the art of record does not teach a specific pressing speed. However, as shown throughout prosecution of the instant application, the pressing speed is a conventional result-effective variable that is routinely adjusted for the purpose of positioning and aligning fibers based on the type of resin and fiber employed. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used routine optimization to determine an optimum pressing speed, due to a variety of unclaimed parameters such as the type of resin employed, the type of fibers employed, equipment availability, etc.

Applicants argue that Lee (‘747) does not teach a carbon-based release agent (see page 13 of the amendment filed December 18, 2003). However, Lee (‘747) specifically teaches that a carbon-based release agent is *equivalent* (emphasis added) to a fluorocarbon-based release agent when releasing a thermoplastic material (see col. 2, lines 35-40).

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefan Staicovici, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1208. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Colaianni, can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stefan Staicovici, PhD



Primary Examiner

3/8/04

AU 1732

March 8, 2004